DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 207 317 EC 140 068

AUTHOR	Gallagher, James J.
TITLE	Days of Reckoning--Days of Opportunity: The 1981 Statesmen's Roundtable.
INSTITUTION	ERIC Clearinghouse on Handicapped and Gifted Children, Reston, Va.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Jun 81
CONTRACT	400-76-0119
NOTE	24p.
AVAILABLE FROM	ERIC Clearinghouse on Handicapped and Gifted Children, The Council for Exceptional Children, 1920 Association Dr., Reston, VA 22091 ($1.00 while supply lasts).
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Accountability; *Disabilities; Educational Trends; Elementary Secondary Education; *Special Education; Special Education Teachers

ABSTRACT

Presented are the formal presentation and edited comments from the 1981 Statesmen's Roundtable focusing on professional accountability in special education. The author's presentation addresses some of the assumptions made about special education, and the role of The Council for Exceptional Children regarding evaluation and accountability. Among the points made are the following: particularly in the case of mildly handicapped children, it is the environmental milieu of the family, the neighborhood, and the school, as well as the child's individual characteristics, that determine how the child fares in the classroom; professionals need to pursue program evaluation both on the full range of developmental characteristics of the child, and in the extent of our programmatic impact on secondary institutions, such as the family and the schools; and The Council for Exceptional Children should see to it that special education leads the way in responsible and comprehensive self evaluation and self improvement. Responses and reactions to the presentation are given for the following individuals: P. Jones, J. Hebeler, J. Birch, J. Dinger, R. Mackie, K. Wyatt, F. Connor, J. Kidd, S. Kirk, P. Smith, R. Simches, and S. Ashcroft. (SB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED207317

DAYS OF RECKONING -- DAYS OF OPPORTUNITY:

THE 1981 STATESMEN'S ROUNDTABLE

James J. Gallagher, Director
Frank Porter Graham Child Development Center
Kenan Professor, School of Education
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

M. Angele Thomas, Editor

June 1981

A Product of the ERIC Clearinghouse on Handicapped and Gifted Children
The Council for Exceptional Children
1920 Association Drive
Reston, Virginia 22091

EC 140068

A publication of the ERIC Clearinghouse on Handicapped and Gifted Children. Publication Date, 1981.

The Council for Exceptional Children, 1920 Association Drive, Reston, Virginia 22091

This publication was prepared with funding from the National Institute of Education, US Department of Education, under contract no. 400-76-0119. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Prior to publication the manuscript was submitted to The Council for Exceptional Children for critical review and determination of professional competence. This publication has met such standards. Points of view, however, do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of either The Council for Exceptional Children, the National Institute of Education, or the Department of Education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Preface	1
Days of Reckoning -- Days of Opportunity	3
Statesmen's Responses and Reactions	13
References	19

PREFACE

On April 27, 1979, a new feature was introduced into the CEC program at the 57th Annual Convention in Dallas, Texas. The Statesmen's Roundtable, as it was called, consisted of papers being presented, followed by discussion among CEC presidents and Wallin Award recipients.

The session was so popular that it has been continued. For the third time, a paper was presented that dealt with issues of concern to CEC as an organization and to the field of special education in general.

On April 16, 1981, in New York City, the site of CEC's 59th Annual Convention, Dr. James Gallagher delivered an address on accountability. Those participating on the panel included the following 14 individuals:

Samuel C. Ashcroft	Professor of Special Education and Director of Graduate Studies, George Peabody College for Teachers, Vanderbilt University. President - 1970-1971.
Jack W. Birch	Professor, School of Education, University of Pittsburgh. President - 1960-1961.
Frances P. Connor	Chairman, Department of Special Education, Teachers College, Columbia University. President - 1963-1964.
Jack C. Dinger	Professor of Special Education, Slippery Rock State College. President - 1973-1974.
Jean R. Hebeler	Professor of Special Education, University of Maryland. President - 1971-1972.
William E. Johnson	Director of Pupil Services, North Kansas City, Missouri School District. President - 1980-1981.
Philip R. Jones	Professor and Head of Special Education Administration, Virginia Polytechnic Institute. President - 1975-1976.
John W. Kidd	Executive Director of CEC-MR. Formerly Assistant Superintendent, Special School District of St. Louis County, Missouri. President - 1968-1969.
Samuel A. Kirk	Formerly Professor of Special Education, University of Arizona. President - 1941-1943. Wallin Award - 1966.
Romaine P. Mackie	Formerly Chief, Unit on Exceptional Children, U.S. Office of Education. Wallin Award - 1978.
Raphael Simches	Special Assistant for Special Education Programs, U.S. Department of Education. President - 1974-1975.

Parthenia Smith	Administrative Assistant, Department of Education, Trenton, New Jersey. President - 1978-1979.
Jo Thomason	Assistant Director of Special Education, Albuquerque Public Schools, Albuquerque, New Mexico. President - 1981-1982.
Kenneth E. Wyatt	Formerly Chairperson, Department of Special Education, Georgia State University. President - 1979-1980.

This publication contains the formal presentation and edited comments from the informal reaction.

M. Angele Thomas

DAYS OF RECKONING -- DAYS OF OPPORTUNITY

Recently, we have been conducting a research effort at the Frank Porter Graham Child Development Center to delineate the role behavior of parents of handicapped children. To our surprise, we have identified 20 separate roles played by parents in the family -- from bookkeeper to social host to teacher to nurse to recreation leader, etc. It brought to a level of consciousness the wide variety of roles we all play in our personal and professional lives. While we have come to a relatively reasonable consensus with regard to our roles as individual professionals, we still have a vague portrait and perhaps have engaged in too limited a discussion of our roles as members of the profession. This paper will try to focus its content around our professions' responsibilities.

WHERE WE HAVE COME FROM

The past quarter of a century has been a fascinating one for those of us interested in exceptional children. In 1955, if we had been asked what would be our heart's desire we might have asked that we have sufficient funds for:

1. Research to generate new ideas and concepts.

2. Personnel training to provide a cadre of well-trained professionals and leaders.

3. Demonstration programs to illustrate exemplary practices.

4. Technical assistance, inservice training, and dissemination to aid those professionals already in the field.

5. A guarantee that no handicapped child would go without an appropriate special educational program.

State budgets for exceptional children increased dramatically during this era. Over one 7 year period the state contributions grew over 300% (Gallagher, Forsythe, Ringelheim, & Weintraub, 1975). The federal cornucopia of legislation during this period gave us resources to meet most of our fondest desires for the handicapped if not for the gifted (see Table 1). The Council for Exceptional Children showed comparable growth during this era, increasing the number of Chapters from 141 to 967 and the number of Federations from 2 to 55 between 1950 and 1980 (Lord, 1981).

Well, in the 1980's we have what we most desired and dreamed about, and now find that paradise is less exotic than it appeared from a distance, and that many of our education colleagues who used to be supportive have turned cold, if not downright hostile. We are such swell people! What happened? Above all, what do we do next?

WHERE ARE WE NOW?

While it is always useful to hold up a mirror and see what is there, it is especially appropriate now with the major political changes in the wind.

Table 1

Highlights of Federal Education Policy for Handicapped Children - 1958-1975

Title	Purpose
P.L. 85-926 (1958)	Grants for teaching in the education of handicapped children, related to education of the mentally retarded.
P.L. 88-164 (1963) (Title III)	Authorization of funds for research and demonstration projects in education of the handicapped.
P.L. 89-10 (1965)	Elementary and Secondary Education Act - Title III authorized assistance to handicapped children in State operated and State supported private day and residential schools.
P.L. 89-313	Amendments of P.L. 89-10 - grants to State educational agencies for the education of handicapped children in State supported institutions.
P.L. 90-170 (1967)	Amendments to P.L. 88-164 - funds for personnel training to care for the mentally retarded and the inclusion of individuals with neurologic conditions related to mental retardation.
P.L. 90-247 (1968)	Amendments of P.L. 89-10 - provided Regional Resource Centers for the improvement of education of handicapped children.
P.L. 90-538 (1968)	Handicapped Children's Early Education Assistance Act - grants for the development and implementation of experimental programs in early education for the handicapped, from birth to age 6.
P.L. 91-230 (1969)	Amendments of P.L. 89-10 - Title VI consolidated into one act the previous enactments relating to handicapped children - Education of the Handicapped.
P.L. 92-424 (1972)	Economic Opportunity Amendments - required that not less than 10% of Head Start enrollment opportunities be available for handicapped children.
P.L. 93-380 (1974)	Amended and expanded Education of the Handicapped Act in response to right to education mandates - required States to establish goal of providing full educational opportunity for all handicapped children, age 0-21.
P.L. 94-142 (1975)	Education for All Handicapped Children Act - required States to provide a free appropriate education for all handicapped children between the ages of 3-18 within the State no later than September 1, 1978.
P.L. 94-142 Section 619	Amendment to P.L. 94-142 to enhance the expansion of services to preschool handicapped children (3-5) through provision of Preschool Incentive Grants.

Why Are We Loved Less?

One of the interesting truths that we have not always recognized is that public attitude toward professionals and their profession varies depending upon the role they are playing. The traditional role for the clinician whose business is to help other people has been viewed with respect and admiration. Whether the pediatrician is reducing the fever of a young child, or the psychotherapist is easing the anxieties of the mental patient, or the surgeon is setting one's insides in order again, they have been honored for their devotion to duty and helpfulness. The dedicated teacher and special educator who have performed similar individual and tutorial types of services have been received in the same appreciative fashion.

It shocks us to find that public reception is less than positive when the same professionals step outside their clinical setting because they realize that many of the important factors influencing the child lie outside the child, and outside the clinician-child, tutor-child relationship. Particularly in the case of mildly handicapped children, it is the environmental milieu of the family, the neighborhood, and the school, as well as the characteristics of the individual child that will determine how the youngster will fare. Under such circumstances, the clinician is no longer merely dealing with the individual child, but often finds himself proposing to change the behavior of large numbers of people. Thus, he is now viewed as playing the role of a social reformer.

We now begin to see that "mainstreaming" brings with it the irritation of those teachers who previously had joyously or gratefully handed these "difficult-to-teach" children over to special education. We have graduated from "nobel practitioners" (i.e., thanks for taking that "terror" off our backs) into genuine pains in the neck, asking the classroom teachers to interact with those handicapped children they previously had been able to refer to the special classroom. This fact, plus our relatively recent special education affluence, can guarantee a lower level of personal and professional popularity.

Some special educators, sensing this change in attitude, would be more than willing to abandon the mildly handicapped to social reformers or political theorists and retreat back to the role of individual clinician dealing only with severely handicapped youngsters. They would then be ready, once again, to receive the praise of those who will call them "dedicated" and "devoted" for spending so much time helping these difficult-to-educate children.

For those of us who are unwilling to abandon our interest in the mildly handicapped, the emotionally disturbed, the learning disabled, or the mildly retarded child, these problems of professional adaptation remain. Our problem is that much of what we wish to affect does lie beyond the individual child. It relates to the family, the neighborhood, the larger school environment, and the community. One of my distinguished medical colleagues at the University of North Carolina recently gave a speech in which he said that advances in medicine had probably gone about as far as they could in improving health services for children and families in this country. Major advances from our current status will come through social changes that would eliminate poverty and its effects, because it is that social cancer that has a negative impact on the health of children and their families, regardless of the general status of American medicine.

The analogy to special education is easy to make. It is the fate of special educators, deeply concerned with these children, that they must risk the disapproval and criticism of persons in the community when they explain that much of what is causing the educational problems of these youngsters is the environmental envelope in which they live. If we believe this, then not only must these youngsters change, but so must many of the people around them, to say nothing of our traditional view of the community. Such a message is unpopular, and we will no longer be called "dedicated" for delivering it, although we may be called a few other things. However, if we are serious about helping youngsters in trouble, it is an issue that must be faced.

Should We Be Accountable?

Franklin Roosevelt once applied the New Testament to my parents' generation thusly: "To whom much is given, much is expected." It ill behooves us, as special educators, to adopt the stance of belligerent defensiveness in the face of questions regarding our own effectiveness, or to retreat into a superior moral posture arguing that we should not be judged against the same standards as other educators because we deal with "handicapped" children. The very size of our budgets guarantees that we will be judged against some standard. Our future, I believe, depends on our facing the issue of accountability squarely and constructively and, through that approach, winning the respect, if not the affection, of our professional colleagues and critics. What is our proper role as members of a profession?

We must ask ourselves some difficult questions. Do we have responsibilities as members of our profession to encourage or support program evaluation if we observe incredibly disorganized secondary education programs for exceptional children? Should we note the manifest overrepresentation of minority group children in special education without asking why or how? Do we have responsibility as a profession to initiate and support followup studies to find out what really happened to our children in adulthood, remembering that that is what our special education programs are organized to be preparing them for?

When you hear comments such as, "I don't want to be bothered," "I'm all right, Jack," "I've got tenure and I'm not worried," it suggests a denial of role responsibilities as a member of the profession. Any profession that delivers services to the public must make a series of assumptions about these services in order to operate at all. The pediatrician must assume that the medicines he prescribes will help and not hurt the patient. The psychiatrist must assume that psychotherapy is going to be beneficial to the mental health of the patient. Similarly, special educators have had to make a number of assumptions, often without proof, as to the nature of their goals, educational strategies, and projected impact. As in any profession, special educators are occasionally called to account and asked to demonstrate that the assumptions around which their professional services are based have a firm basis in fact. Let us review some of the assumptions that are made with regard to special education:

1. Specially trained personnel can deliver services more effectively and efficiently to exceptional children than personnel without special training. Can we prove that?

2. Special learning environments such as resource rooms, special classes, and special schools create a better learning environment for the exceptional child than the undifferentiated standard educational program. Can we prove that?

3. Special equipment and technology can provide additional learning efficiency and effectiveness for certain kinds of handicapped children. Can we prove that?

4. Differential curriculum, designed to meet the specific needs of exceptional children, helps the student learn more effectively and efficiently than the standard curriculum. Can we prove that?

This is a small set of a much larger collection of assumptions that form the basis for the delivery of our professional services. We now are called upon to demonstrate the validity of these assumptions because it is these assumptions that justify the extra costs that are incurred through special education.

We tend to be not well thought of, when we are thought of at all, by the educational psychology fraternity. In their latest evaluation book, Cronbach and his colleagues (1980) have one page out of 430 to give us, and they give us this:

> Consider education for the mentally and physically handicapped, an arena haunted by the ghosts of disappointed hope. Over much of this century, parents' disappointment with the available services most often was heard politically as a demand for more of the same services. Quite a few evaluations looked at the educational results and were unable to show that the slow paced and sometimes vacuous "special" programs made for better learning or better mental health. (p. 163)

We would have to have a true loss of nerve to throw ourselves into the evaluative arms of this group who neither understand nor respect the work we have done. If it is evaluation we need, then we need to develop the potential to do it ourselves. We have the talent -- we recruited it over those 15 years (Salvia & Ysseldyke, 1978).

Scriven (1973) was one of the first to use the phrase "formative evaluation" and it is a good one for special educators to adopt. He differentiated formative evaluation -- which is the systematic collection of information for the purposes of improving the program -- from summative evaluation which collects information for the purpose of making a "Go-No Go," "Support-Don't Support" program decision. It is the formative approach we seek.

One of the first tasks of any evaluation is setting reasonable goals and objectives, and one of the advantages of a requirement for program evaluation is that it forces us to think about such goals and objectives. In this instance, our goals represent long-term intent -- the effective adult adaptation of the exceptional child. It is the fate of most of us to deal with only a cross-sectional slice of the vertical development of an individual child. That is our role responsibility as professionals. As a profession, however, we have a responsibility to look at more than just our particular slice, whether it be the preschool age, preadolescent age, or the adolescent or adult level.

What are our goals for a child who is deaf or blind -- not just at the age of 3, but at the ages of 8, 14, and 22? How do these goals link together in these various stages? Why should we not be articulate as a profession about what our developmental goals are in each of the various areas of exceptionality? If we can state our overall intent and reasonable expectations, then we are in a better position to state measurable objectives at each level that can tell us how much we expect to achieve, by when, and by whom.

It is likely that more programs have been damaged by unrealistic expectations than any other single reason. Recently, we had a distinguished visitor at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Ed Zigler, who gave the annual Ira Gordon Memorial Lecture. Among other things, he detailed the spectacular ups-and-downs of the Head Start program. Once it was established, the Head Start program probably produced pretty much the same gains in children 10 years ago as it does now. The wildly vacillating attitudes toward Head Start were really based upon a fluctuating set of expectations rather than the actual performance or child outcomes. At one point, it was expected that Head Start would be the key to unlocking the secrets to poverty and its influence on the next generation. At another time, it was felt to be a demonstration of the total failure of education or the social sciences to provide any meaningful help. It is neither of these, of course, but somewhat in between. If we are to avoid such vacillating expectations, we must play a significant role in formulating both our goals and expectations on a reasonable level and not leave that formulation, by default, to political friends and foes who have their own agenda (Zigler & Trickett, 1978).

Nowhere is this need to establish expectations more important than with the issue of our effectiveness in intervening with mildly retarded children. If we expect our programs to have total influence over the full range of potential intellectual performance of human beings, then the changes we are actually able to make are going to look quite small. Depending upon our measures, IQ scores can range from almost 0 to well over 200. Does this mean that an intervention program has the potential or expectations that, given the right set of circumstances, it can move the youngster from anywhere in that distribution to anywhere else?

The novel Flowers for Algernon (Keyes, 1966), which was turned into the movie Charly, documents the transformation of a mentally retarded individual into an extremely gifted individual and back again through the use of a miracle drug. We recognize this story for the science fiction that it is, because we know we cannot, with our current knowledge and skills, do such a thing. What we can do, however, is to help retarded youngsters modify their developmental patterns to a level of an average of one-half standard deviation, or about 8 to 10 IQ points.

If we believe the behavioral geneticists (Plomin, DeFries, & McClearn, 1980), then one can expect a range of about one standard deviation as the phenotypic contribution to the total of intellectual behavior. Average gains of 7 or 8 IQ points represent about 50 to 60% of what is possible and, thus represent a substantial accomplishment. Also, moving a group of youngsters from IQ 70 to IQ 80, while not as dramatic as the miracle drugs, certainly represents meaningful social and educational gain. The work of the Lazar consortium (Lazar et al., 1977) in reviewing the long-term effects of preschool intervention, and the study of Weikart and his colleagues (Weber, Foster, & Weikart, 1978) documenting cost effectiveness of preschool

intervention, both suggest that such intervention does pay off in very tangible ways. As a matter of fact, the Lazar consortium placed great weight on the ability of such programs to keep youngsters out of special education as one of the demonstrable cost effective outputs.

Our evaluation efforts must extend, in much greater breadth and depth, beyond a simple-minded IQ gain approach. Herbert Birch (Birch & Gussow, 1970) once marveled why social scientists, in a burst of bad judgment, risked their reputation on their ability to modify the one human characteristic that has proven itself most resistant to change and modification -- namely, cognitive and intellectual development. In turn, they tended to ignore those dimensions of human behavior that we know are more plastic and more responsive to various types of intervention. Among those behaviors, of course, are what we call social adaptation and motivation. These characteristics play an important role in an adult's adjustment to society, more so than the cognitive behavior that we have focused upon.

Sometimes we suspect our preoccupations with cognitive behaviors are determined by the availability of measuring instruments in this area (the IQ and achievement tests). Further breadth of evaluation must lie on our examining the impact of our programs on the family and on organizations, such as the schools, as well. If we can believe the response of family members, the programs and services we provide can make the difference between family disintegration and family integration (Turnbull & Turnbull, 1978). Such a difference is a measurable benefit that has to be put on the scales of total program benefits and gains. Further, we need to measure our similar impact on schools and organizations.

I recently pointed out to some colleagues in general education that those interested in exceptional children have provided many demonstrable contributions to the total field. A few of these include the development of measures of intelligence, the emphasis on creative thinking and problem solving for the gifted, and greater comprehension of behavior problems and personality difficulties. The IEP, or individualized education program, is a beginning attempt to state more explicit individual developmental program objectives (Gallagher, 1972). The participation of parents in stating those objectives, however imperfectly carried out, is still a legitimate goal for the schools for all children in this latter half of the twentieth century. We need to pursue program evaluation both on the full range of developmental characteristics of the child, and in the extent of our programmatic impact on secondary institutions, such as the family and the schools.

WHERE ARE WE GOING? HOW CAN CEC HELP?

How should The Council for Exceptional Children respond to these issues? Our professions are playing for high stakes. Because of its multidisciplinary stance, this professional organization -- more than any other -- must continue to provide the leadership for responsible professionalism. Such leadership can be illustrated by:

1. Supporting training workshops to extend the sophistication of program evaluation concepts among the special education professions.

2. Endorsing a major research and development effort that would gather important program information across exceptionalities and improved evaluation methodology to help answer our questions and test our assumptions.

3. Paying special attention to the issues of evaluation through invited speakers or distinguished guests at forthcoming convention programs and institutes.

4. Designing special publications that would provide thematic coverage of our assessment and program evaluation efforts.

The Council must continue to be our eyes and ears and, occasionally, our voice in policy circles in Washington. CEC must train others to play these roles in state capitals. Ill winds are blowing and we cannot afford lesions in our professional communications. Two of the most distressing of these negative trends abroad today deserve special notice.

Block Grants and All That

We in special education have been fortunate to have the opportunity to pursue innovative ways of providing services through our various legislative authorities. In rehabilitation and special education the new tendency toward block grants would threaten such adventures and CEC needs to be forthright in fighting these tendencies. The block grant approach has two dangers. First, it risks having special education funds erode into a larger undifferentiated basket of funds for "children in trouble." Another danger is that it would eliminate, in large measure, those innovative research, development, demonstration, evaluation, and dissemination efforts that have played a role in increasing the quality of services in favor of the always heavy demands for support of direct service at the local and state level. Early childhood efforts may largely disappear.

The truth of the matter seems to be that if we wish innovation and improvement, we need to mandate it. This could be done by simply setting aside 10 to 15% of the funds that go to the handicapped for various programs of research innovation, development, and evaluation, the exact shape and form of which would be decided at the local or state level (Gallagher, 1979).

The Role of Universities

There appear to be some genuine negative feelings about universities and university professors that are being played out in current educational politics. These professors have been flying high, literally and figuratively, for some time, and it is a great temptation to give them a just comeuppance. However, the role of the major universities in providing a continuous flow of well-trained teachers, specialists, and ideas can hardly be overestimated. Any service program that cuts its links with the university is in danger of cutting its links to the newest in thought and research. CEC itself has depended in no small measure upon the universities for leadership and creative ideas.

Fields that have been separated from the intellectual resources of the university, as in the early days of deaf education or the education of the visually handicapped, or, right now, in programs for the gifted, generally fall into a pattern of rather sterile and routine passage of conventional wisdom from one generation of teachers to the next with little innovation or

change. Exceptional children need and deserve better than that. By putting aside the universities, the profession of special education is risking its own future.

WHAT WILL EVALUATION DO FOR US? TO US?

The Frank Porter Graham Child Development Center, of which I am the director, recently spent nearly 4 months preparing for an evaluation of one of its own research programs. This evaluation and review included a 2 day site visit by a group of distinguished scientists. The anxiety and concern that accompany such evaluations can never be underestimated. Anyone who has been though similar experiences can understand the tension that mounts as the key visit approaches.

As our various subgroups in the Center prepared themselves for the site visit, I was fond of quoting an old statement that "any experience that doesn't actually kill you will make you stronger." After a while, these subgroups were asking me if I didn't have something more important to do, and would I please go away and stop repeating that cliche! However, like most cliches there is a strong core of truth to this statement. We are now a stronger, more effective staff and center as a result of this painful evaluation.

We can say the same thing about the prospective evaluations of our profession. It will not be easy, technically or emotionally, to put ourselves through this wringer of formative evaluation but in the long run we should be a stronger and more effective profession for it.

I am suggesting that all of the components and divisions of The Council for Exceptional Children band together, perhaps even starting a steering committee to plan an organization-wide campaign, to see to it that special education leads the way in responsible and comprehensive self-evaluation and self-improvement. Just as special educators have given important leadership to the broad field of education in the past, this could be one of their major contributions to education in the 1980's.

STATESMEN'S RESPONSES AND REACTIONS

Phil Jones: We are facing new challenges. The key phase we have been in since the passage of P.L. 94-142 has been definitely a numbers game or a quantitative phase. We've been worried about how many dollars we are receiving, how many children are being served; we've measured everything on quantity. And we've not asked the questions that Jim is asking: "What's coming from the dollars? Are we serving students better?" We are now at that point, with or without budget cuts, when we are going to be asked the qualitative questions. In Washington, the minute you go over a billion dollar appropriation, qualitative questions are asked. What have those dollars accomplished? It's not going to be enough to say, "We're serving 4.2 million kids." We must account for how we are serving them, what are we doing for them, and hopefully not to them.

Jean Hebeler: I'd like to follow up on Phil's comments in the same vein. In evaluation strategy, we slide over into the impact problem which is what I see as the area we need to focus on as professionals. I think CEC can play a major role in helping the various segments of our profession work on this. I find that frequently we look at the administrative arrangement under which something is occurring without evaluating, for instance, whether a resource room or special class or special school is in and of itself most effective. I would suspect that many in the audience, as well as many on the dais here, are finding it disparaging that we have not kept up with our objectives in developing the competencies among ourselves to actually do those things. I think special educators are probably better at doing the special things that we purport to do than we are at doing the regular things that we also need to be doing in order to deliver good, basic educational programs for exceptional children. I'm talking about the accountability Jim was referring to--breaking out content in terms of sequential development and then applying that to good instructional programs. We need to focus more on where we put the students, what kind of special person works with them, and how frequently, rather than merely tracking that program. I think that is a very important aspect of evaluation and, obviously, program development is part of that.

Jack Birch: I want to take off on the notion of why we are loved less. I think that is a well turned phrase. I think it is because we have been willing to take money and to take plaudits from almost anybody, from almost any source. Yet at the same time we were unwilling to share our skills and our capabilities with others. And we've been unwilling, as Jim points out, to enter serious evaluations of ourselves and what we are doing. We have been at the helm politically when it serves our purposes. But we've not been willing to try to understand real politics, to learn to work with others, to serve other people's interests in politics and regular education. These things seem to me to be true, but I hope we aren't going to stop at self-flagellation. I think that Jim means that too. We have to see where we are before we know which way to go. My hope is that we are going to pay much more attention than we have in the past to state and local levels of operation. I don't deny the importance at all and I second the motion to continue work at the federal level. However, I think it is very important that we realize that most special education is led and paid for at the state and local level. We need to turn some of our own thinking in that direction.

For instance, here we are at a great national meeting. It's in the state of New York, which has a tremendous operating school system. It's larger than that of most nations. When we leave this meeting, how much have we learned about the state of New York's operation? What do we know that we can take away and use? There's a lot here to be learned. Sure they have problems. Are we willing to look at them? Understand them? Focus in on where the action is? We have paid a great deal of attention to work at the national level. I'm not disparaging that at all. I'm saying that realistically, however, 90% at least of the costs of education in the United States are put at the state and local level. Where the money is, that is where the power is. Have we been willing to involve ourselves, really, in work at the state level and at the local operational levels? I'd like to see more of that.

Jack Dinger: Jim Gallagher has given us a very valid, brief history of special education in terms of how we have acquired the problems we currently face. In spite of our efforts to help handicapped children, we've done it in a "cocoon" kind of way, largely by default. The regular educators have given us their special children and told us to take them away and we've gone away with them. We've built our own little empire. Lucky for us, it's been through the gift of some very substantial funding by BEH. Not only have we had that, it's increased envy and jealousy from among our regular colleagues, further isolating us from them. As a result, we sat in conventions just like this, year after year, talking to ourselves. We never have regular educators with us, we never go to meetings as a profession. We increase the communications gap year by year. Now suddenly, somebody suggests we ought to be into mainstreaming with a forced marriage between regular education and special education. It's just not about to happen. Jim's point is very well taken. Four basic ingredients are prerequisite to successful special education: special personnel, special curriculum, special technology, and special methodologies. And yet none of them has been proven. We practice it daily, not knowing. We have no proof that a particular intervention has worked well, so it's about time we either accept this challenge of accountability or get out of the business of claiming that we have something special. CEC can help in a number of ways. That should be one of our major next goals of the organization: to establish a direction of where we are going, what our objectives are for this new marriage with regular education. We've got to develop a cooperative effort with them so we can be of service to all children, not just the handicapped. We really haven't been interested in doing that over the past 25 years, and it is going to take some real soul searching and some role identity changes and ego evolvement changes to work with regular educators. So, I think that's our next step, to start having some joint physical presence, some communication, let our professional organization here lead the way for us and give us some guiding lights and direction.

Romaine Mackie: I've been in special education for quite a while, and as I look back I see the things that helped us enlarge the field and enlarge our influence. It seems we have lost one of the most important factors, and that is the close working relationships with parents. We will not be able to advance in any way unless we again get close to the parents. We have simply isolated ourselves too much.

Ken Wyatt: I'd like to go back to Jim's comments in terms of why we are loved less. I'm not basically a pessimistic person, but I would have to say that I

am not sure we were ever loved at all. I think that perhaps we were appreciated in the same way we appreciate garbage men who come and take away our trash. And we were tolerated because we presented no significant threat to the establishment that existed at that point. I'm not sure we're seeing a shift in attitude at all, either positive or negative, at the present time. Now perhaps there is more willingness because of the power status we have achieved to express some age-old prejudices that have been there all along. I'm convinced that as a result of the legislation and the funds we have been given, we are doing a better job in special education. But I'm not sure that even with good, positive evaluation we are necessarily going to change basic attitudes, primarily because we still continue to present a threat to the educational setting. We have problems in terms of acceptance even within our own profession. When you look at the special education professional population in the United States and recognize that fewer than 1 in 4 belong to CEC or to any professional organization, that's a source of concern, because it is through professional organizations that we have strength. The evaluating trend you speak of is necessary not to change attitudes, but for our own professional well being in our own community.

Frances Connor: To my mind program standards is probably one of the more critical factors the profession faces. I've been concerned about excess teachers moving into the roles of special educators and about supervisors moving from other fields into special ed. Programs are developing to incorporate our disabled youngsters into more general education programs. When teachers ask questions about some of the severely handicapped low incidence youngsters and the supervisors say, "But, dear, you know much more about it than I do," it's a sad state of affairs. Recently at Teachers' College, we have been asked if we would establish a program to prepare, may I say, excess college and university professors to replace those instructors (nontenured faculty, adjunct professors in special ed) upon whom we have depended for so long for expertise and sound practice. The question is, can we prepare people from history, anthropology, other areas where enrollments have diminished, to replace special education specialists? In other words, colleges and universities are in terrible trouble financially. They are in terrible trouble with the general population of students. They, therefore, need places to put students. Now, if indeed, we are going to criticize the universities on what's happening, somehow or other we've got to go back and revitalize those professional standards, procedures, and efforts that we had through the 1950's. We had better look to see what is needed in special ed and what is needed by teachers, supervisors, administrators, and college professors. We need to reconsider what we are offering in colleges and universities that might be different from a continuing inservice education where there is less accountability.

My second question relates to the plight of the public schools. We have recent reports from James Coleman and from Andrew Greeley indicating that higher achievement occurs in the private and parochial schools than in the public schools, especially in the urban areas. It seems to me that this is where we are skimming off the top from the public schools. Competency examinations are the criteria for graduation from high school. On the basis of those competency tests, we not only deny diplomas to the youngsters in the remaining population of the public schools, but we also de-accredit the high school. A parent says, "I don't want my youngster in a nonaccredited high school if I expect him to move ahead. Therefore, I'm motivated to go into the private sector and I use every bit of funds that I have in order to do

that." The other question that I see being generated is that teachers in public education are saying, "Thank goodness for tuition tax benefits. That means these difficult children can be placed in a private school." But the next thing you must say is, "Wait a minute, are there any public schools left in which I am going to be able to work?"

John Kidd: I think CEC might now advocate for equitable, rather than equal, educational opportunity for all children and youth, not just for special education children and youth. This is very important because equitable opportunity for different kinds of learners inevitably involves varying costs. At the same time educational opportunity for exceptional children must not be at the expense of any other children. This society not only can't afford to, but can't afford not to, provide optimal educational experiences for all of its children and youth. Like Harold Howe once said, "Let us set about providing the American chance for every American kid."

Sam Kirk: Formative evaluation is good. It's internal and set up for the purpose of evaluating one's programs in order to improve. However, we also need external evaluation of our programs because within the field, we are very divided. We have many ideas. We have contradictory ideas. We have special interests. I'd like to see CEC set up an external evaluation of programs from a policy point of view, a philosophical point of view, and an objective point of view. We need some great brains to think up some ideas for us, unify us, and bring out the real issues that we have to deal with.

Parthenia Smith: The world is having a major impact on what is happening in our educational communities today. I think that is the one thing that I would like to say in response to Jim's paper. We really have to look at the rapid changes occurring. We say we are planning and we want to do some evaluation, but what happens with those evaluation results? Next year they are no longer valid because the world has changed. We have to acknowledge that and plan accordingly. I think we have to not only look at what's changing in education, but in the economical, social, and political aspects. All of that impacts on what students learn. That is why it is so important to build accountability into our future planning. If we lose the monitoring aspect of education, we're not going to be accountable for what we say we're all about.

Ray Simches: I think part of our problem is that we are in a situation where we are dealing with incompatibles. The nature of how incompatible things are relates to aspirations, expectancies, and achievements. The further we distance ourselves from children, the more we lose reality of the incompatible lives that handicapped children and their parents are confronted with. By incompatible, I mean we have drives that are forcing us in two opposite directions. When we talk about labels, there are drives to push for labels as well as forces that oppose the use of labels. There are influences that push for special classes, and those that push against them. There are forces that push for resource rooms and those that push against them. So we are rarely in a compatible system. We deal with handicapped children and, somehow or other, there's a desire to make them compatible with the society in which they live. Yet we are dealing with a society that may be incompatible with these very children. We are constantly whipsawed between that which we romanticize, that which we philosophize, that which we hope for, and that which is reality.

Another thing, we are also, at the present time, dealing with public schools. If the public schools are the mirror of our society, what are we going to do? Are we going to smash the mirrors? Or are we going to change what we are looking at? I think we are unhappy because the public schools are the mirrors of our society and we are having difficulty with that. I sincerely hope that we don't destroy our schools because we are not pleased with our society. That has played a role in special ed and where we are. As we get upset about what is happening today, let us remember that what we may be responding to is the image, that thing reflected in the mirror of our schools. Perhaps we're getting angry about the wrong things, and maybe we're not angry enough about those things that are reflected in the mirror.

Samuel Ashcroft: Why are we loved less? Why block grants? Why recissions? I think it's an attitudinal problem. We did ask for lots of things back in the 50's, 60's, and 70's. Many of the things we got were our heart's desires like research to generate new ideas, personnel training opportunities, demonstration programs, and technical assistance. But one of the most neglected errors in research and in our training programs is changing attitudes for handicapped persons. It seems to me that if we could have done a better job in this regard over the past 25 years we might be in a different place today. What concerns me more is that the proposed recissions, cuts, and block grants constitute an attitude of the current administration. It views these special education programs as dispensable, as surplus populations and not deserving of appropriate education. It seems to me that CEC should focus on changing attitudes toward handicapped persons, and toward the programs provided, in order to preserve the funding base that has been built over the years.

Jo Thomason: Thank you very much. Before we close I want to give Dr. Gallagher an opportunity for rebuttal.

James Gallagher: One of the first things I teach my students is that evaluation is both a technical and a political tool. It requires a great deal of technical expertise, but I also try to impress upon them that the first thing to ask about a program evaluation is, "Who wants it? Who is the person asking for the evaluation?" Second, "What are they planning to do with the results? And third, "Can you count upon a fair hearing and a competent technical job to be done as a result of this?" What I am really arguing for is that we have to develop the technical skills and expertise so that we don't stab ourselves. The truth of the matter is that evaluation is a sharp knife and as we start waving it around, we have to determine which way the point is directed. We are indeed doing good things in special education. However, if we just do a mediocre job of evaluation, we run the risk of downgrading ourselves. We run the risk of not presenting an accurate portrait of the benefits we have created and we will end up then with somebody else using that evaluation to our detriment.

Jean Hebeler talked about what is important to do in an evaluation process. Forget about where the instruction is taking place; pay attention to what is going on, analyze and describe it. We've got a special treatment. What is the nature of the treatment? If a doctor came to you and said, "I've got a miracle drug that is going to cure all the problems that you have," you are justified in asking him, "What's in that pill? I'd like to know." Likewise, if somebody comes to you and says, "I've got a special education program that's really going to do something special for your students," I think people have a right to ask,

"What's inside that pill? What is that special thing that you are going to do? Can you demonstrate what you are doing?" So the nature of the treatment, the task analysis of what is actually going on in that interaction between the teacher and the child, is the thing that needs to be looked at. Jack Birch talked about where the action is taking place -- the action is taking place at the local level and at the state level, as he says. The problem with that is that we at one time tried to go into the state budget of the State of North Carolina, determined to find everything that dealt with ways of improving the programs; not just carrying out programs, but improving them -- research, program development, dissemination. As near as we could tell, in the education budget, about 1/4 to 1/3 of one percent could be identified that way. If somebody came down from Mars and were asked, "Are you happy with this operation? Are you really satisfied with the way it's going?" the Martian would have to say, "Yes. My goodness, they are spending 99.5% in keeping things going just the way they are, and they are putting 1/2 of one percent into trying to find ways to improve it." Now the role the federal government has played, and the most constructive role, in my view, has been in providing the resources to improve quality and stimulate program innovation and review. I'm hopeful if the money does go back to the states, we can work with the states to help emulate much more of this kind of activity. What I was trying to present is an upbeat message of saying, the future is not dead. We need not despair at the political level. We need not despair at the professional level. What we do need, however, is coordinated professional effort that will organize ourselves to deal more effectively with these issues that relate to our role as a total profession. We already understand how to deal with our role as individual professional workers.

Jo Thomason: Thank you.

REFERENCES

Argyris, C., & Schon, D. Theory in practice: Increasing professional effectiveness. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

Birch, H.G., & Gussow, J. Disadvantaged children. New York: Harcourt, Brace, & World, 1970.

Cronbach, L., Ambron, S., Dornbusch, S., Hess, R., Hornik, R., Phillips, D., Walker, D., & Weiner, S. Toward reform of program evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.

Gallagher, J. The special education contract for mildly handicapped children. Exceptional Children, 1972, 38, 527-535.

Gallagher, J. The trend to contract research: Problems and opportunities. Education Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 1979, 1, 29-38.

Gallagher, J. Why the government breaks its promises. N. Y. U. Education Quarterly, 1975, 6, 22-27.

Gallagher, J., Forsythe, P., Ringelheim, D., & Weintraub, F. Federal and state funding patterns for programs for the handicapped. In N. Hobbs (Ed.), Issues in the classification of children: A handbook on categories, labels and their consequences. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

House, E. Evaluating with validity. Beverly Hills CA: Sage Publications, 1980.

Keyes, D. Flowers for Algernon. New York: Harcourt, Brace, & Jovanovich, 1966.

Lazar, I., Hubbell, V.R., Murray, H., Rosche, M., & Royce, J. The persistence of preschool effects: A long-term followup of fourteen infant and preschool experiments (Final report for grant #18-76-07843). Ithaca NY: Cornell University, Community Service Laboratory, September 1977.

Lord, F. The CEC story: The attainment of professional stature (1950-1980). Exceptional Children, 1981, 47(6), 435-452.

Plomin, R., DeFries, J., & McClearn, G. Behavioral genetics: A primer. San Francisco: W.H. Freeman, 1980.

Salvia, J., & Ysseldyke, J. Assessment in special and remedial education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1978.

Scriven, M. Goal free evaluation. In E. House (Ed.), School evaluation. Berkeley CA: McCutchan Publishing, 1973.

Toffler, A. The third wave. New York: Bantam, 1980.

Turnbull, H., & Turnbull, A. (Eds.). Parents speak out: Views from the other side of a two way mirror. Columbus OH: Charles E. Merrill, 1978.

Weber, C., Foster, P., & Weikart, D. An economic analyses of the Ypsilanti-Perry preschool project. Ypsilanti MI: High/Scope Educational Research Foundation, 1978.

Zigler, E., & Trickett, P.K. IQ, social competence, and evaluation of early childhood intervention programs. American Psychologist, 1978, 33(9), 789-798.